

**REMARKS**

In the May 1, 2007 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 1-6, 14-19, 25-31 and 37-54 were pending in the application and rejected all of the pending claims under 35 USC § 103(a). In rejecting the claims, the following U.S. Patents were cited: 5,717,939 to Bricklin et al.; 5,793,350 to Chandavarkar et al.; 6,388,638 to Fukushima et al. (References A (p.1), H (p.2) and K (p.2), respectively, in the June 6, 2003 Office Action); 5,809,183 to Serizawa et al. (Reference A in the May 19, 2004 Office Action); and 6,549,214 to Patel et al. (Reference J in the April 1, 2005 Office Action). In addition, Japanese Patent Publication No. 5-119696 by Sakamoto (Reference N in the May 1, 2007 Office Action) was cited. Claims 1-6, 14-19, 25-31 and 37-54 remain in the case. The rejections are traversed below.

In items 6-20 on pages 2-9 of the May 1, 2007 Office Action, claims 1, 2, 14, 19, 25, 26, 31, 37, 39, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49, 50, 52 and 54 were rejected as unpatentable over Bricklin et al. in view of Patel et al. and further in view of Sakamoto; in items 21-32 on pages 9-14, claims 3, 4, 15, 16, 27, 28, 38, 40, 42, 45, 48, 51 and 53 were rejected as unpatentable over Bricklin et al. in view of Serizawa et al. and further in view of Sakamoto; in items 33-35 on pages 14-16, claims 5, 17 and 29 were rejected as unpatentable over Bricklin et al., Serizawa et al. and Sakamoto in view of Chandavarkar et al.; and in items 36-38 on pages 16-17, claims 6, 18 and 30 were rejected as unpatentable over Bricklin et al., Serizawa et al. and Sakamoto in view of Fukushima et al..

Thus, Sakamoto was used as the tertiary reference in all of the combinations of references used to reject the claims. However, nothing in the Japanese language publication of Sakamoto was cited; only the English Abstract of Sakamoto was cited. In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action asserted that the English Abstract of Sakamoto discloses "the storing section and display control section as claimed" (Office Action, page 4, lines 6-7). Presumably, the quoted text refers to the details of the storing section and display control section recited in claim 1.

The first sentence of the English Abstract of Sakamoto states "[m]ap data of the **designated** scale ratio is read from a map data storing medium 5 where plural kinds of map data with the different scale ratios ... are stored" (emphasis added). In other words, according to the English Abstract of Sakamoto, first a scale ratio is determined and then that scale ratio is used to determine a set of map data to read from storage. On the other hand, claim 1 recites storing "the image magnification ratio calculated by said arithmetic section ... [and] display position information" (claim 1, lines 10-11) in the first storing section and subsequently "displaying said part of the original image ... at the image magnification ratio ... after obtaining

... the display position information and the image magnification ratio from said first storing section" (claim 1, last lines 14-17). Thus, based on the English Abstract, Sakamoto fails to teach a key feature of the invention, i.e., storing the magnification ratio to be used when the image is subsequently displayed.

Furthermore, review of the entirety of Sakamoto in Japanese by the applicants found only disclosure of storing plural kinds of map data with different scale ratios and displaying the map data on a display screen without editing the data based on scale ratio. Nothing was found in Sakamoto regarding creation of a display image that is part of a stored original image by enlarging or reducing the original image based on an image magnification ratio calculated by an arithmetic section, as recited in claim 1.

Limitations similar to those quoted above from claim 1 can be found in all of the independent claims. Therefore, it is submitted that 1-6, 14-19, 25-31 and 37-54 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for at least the reasons discussed above.

### **Summary**

It is submitted that the references cited by the Examiner, taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the features recited in the claims. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1-6, 14-19, 25-31 and 37-54 are in a condition suitable for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 1, 2007

By: Richard A. Gollhofer  
Richard A. Gollhofer  
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501